PRICE ONE PENNY.

42

1892

LABOUR ROBBERY,

THE POLITICIAN UNMASKED.

By W. BARKER.

MAN AND PROGRESS.

Whether in the domain of science, art, or industry, it cannot be denied that the progress of man has been extremely slow Our methods of production by the use of steam and labour-saving machinery, our intercourse with other countries by means of electricity, ocean navigation, the telephone, etc.—these discoveries are pointed to with pride by the superficial observer; but when we trace our primitive ancestors from their caves of many thousand years ago, and review the slow and painful march of reform, the unutterable suffering, the numerous martyrs, the bloodshed and struggles of countless ages, to gain us even the slightest reforms, thoughtful people are prone to ask *why* is human progress so slow? Moreover what is and has been true in the industrial and scientific world, is also true regarding the development of human thought. The bravest and best of the human race have sealed their doctrine with their blood. Strange indeed, but true, that seldom are the virtues of true men recognized while living. The vice of one age often becomes the virtue of the next. One generation hangs its philosophers and social reformers; the next erects monuments to their memory. Why is this? How comes it that one section of the human race in the past has always had the power to destroy the more advanced? The answer is briefly summarised in one word—GOVERNMENT.

Whether, as Volney says, tyranny evolved from augury, culminating in priestcraft, or from the head of the family or tribe, according to Bronterre O'Brien, whether Assyria or Egypt claims the first government, it is self-evident and admitted by even the politician of to-day, that the less of government the better for all. Statistics prove that morality and virtue increase in proportion as laws become obsolete or relaxed; yet to-day, despite the les-

sons that history teaches, the present governments, true to their attributes of brutality, like all their predecessors seek to crush out every aspiration of the human race by the bludgeon and bayonet. They would still stop the march of intellect and stem the tide of evolution by the aid of the common hangman.

THE FOLLY OF VOTING.

Now whatever benefits may accrue by a change of government to those owning land and capital, it is clear that the working man can obtain nothing. Why! Because, being an economic slave —that is, having no land or capital of his own—he is forced by necessity either to sell his labour power—his only capital—to those who own these natural resources, or to starve. The science of politics is law-making, or the right to govern; but how can a man who cannot control the price of his day's work or of a loaf of bread, have more than a merely technical right to vote? Whatever may be his country, by law he is a trespasser; and cannot therefore pass laws to govern those who own him, (that is, his means of life).

What *is* Government? That word embraces all the villanies that have *ever* been perpetrated on the human race. What is Law? A human trick, by which the few secure to themselves the right to hold and hand down to *their* children the privileges secured to them by murder and robbery. By *law* our very birthright in the land is owned as *private* property. By law, money, *first* introduced to exchange equivalent values, is now monopolised and its true function, as a medium of exchange, destroyed; thus giving a few banking swindlers the right to contract or expand the currency at will, and so fix the purchasing power of what once was a mere symbol of exchange.

LAW—v—MORALITY.

Morality never did or can exist without Liberty (not licence, but reciprocal liberty.) Where the prison and the gallows have failed hitherto to reform mankind, education and the change of environment have been successful. Irrefutable statistics prove that in proportion as the church has lost its influence and the severity of law been relaxed, in the same ratio has crime diminished in England. Why? Because law deals with effects; never with causes. You may tie a man's hands behind him, and thus make a virtue of necessity; but you leave his moral nature untouched. With Bakounine we deny either its necessity or morality; and with Burke, we say "its every form is bad." In our own country, precisely the same state of things prevails now as would obtain in a savage state without laws or civilization; for the weak and defenceless are robbed to-day by those stronger

than themselves, either physically, mentally, or financially. The imperfections and criminal tendencies of man are often advanced as a justification for government; but these should be the strongest argument for its *abolition*. For, if the *mass* is faulty, the *unit* will also be faulty, and this ought to afford an additional reason why he should not be allowed to impose *his* imperfections on others. The politician was not required until some had acquired undue privileges; and government would be superfluous to-day but for the same reason. Legislation is unnecessary except in a community of slaves on the one hand, and tyrants on the other.

Most men will tell you that *they* would be the last to violate the rights of others; yet when the abolition of law is proposed, instantly exclaim that you MUST have laws to restrain, *not themselves* but *other people*. Government, implies a subject class; which is tyranny. Either *all* have rights, or *none* have rights. If it is not right for *one* man to force his will on another man who does not injure him, a thousand men can have *no* such right. Government is force and cannot be logically qualified. Every law finds expression either in the baton or the bayonet. All reforms have been gained in opposition to the laws. Legions of martyrs have died and rivers of blood have flowed to give us even the little liberty we possess to-day. To moralise man, he must be educated; to gain his freedom, he must assert his manhood.

REFORM AND REFORMERS.

On the various reforms that have been put forward—such as Thrift, Temperance, Malthusianism, and Religion—it is scarcely worth while here to dwell, seeing that whatever good there may be in them, or however conscientious may be their advocates, they do not touch the basis of poverty. For, if all men were temperate, thrifty, religious, or without families, they would *still* be the slaves of those who held private property in Land and Capital; and this monopoly of the raw material and human products, past and present, in every country *is* defended by law: in consequence of which, it is a notorious fact that in India, and in other countries where the people are both thrifty and temperate, they are even more poverty-stricken than ourselves. So it is in sparsely settled countries, such as Australia, Canada, etc., they suffer as much from poverty in proportion to the population as we do.

MOB-RULE.

Social-Democracy, or majority-rule, is the latest political dodge with which we are acquainted; and to the minds of the Anarchists it is the most illogical. For, while fully admitting with us

that past governments have always been the greatest barriers to human progress, they tell us in the next breath that it is because we are not governed by the right party. The weapon that robs us is good in itself if only the right men wield it.

This camp is divided into two sections. There are first the unconscious dupes who are honest but ignorant; on the other hand the conscious mediocrities and would-be leaders, who see in this movement a capital chance for climbing into office and sinecure on the backs of the aforesaid dupes. As to the methods adopted by these leaders to gain popularity, they would be highly amusing but for the sorrowful fact that working men have been *gulled* and *robbed* for ages by such-like sophistry. Taxation, they say, keeps us poor and oppressed, which is true; but they would *relieve* poverty and give employment, by *borrowing* money to start unprofitable improvements, thus again mortgaging the *lives* of the coming generation.

Sidney Webb, L. L. B. barrister-at-law, tells us in the Fabian Essays, that we have had practical Social-Democracy in England for the past fifty years, and exults in the fact that our largest employer of labour, the Postmaster General, is also a Minister of the Crown. This action of the State, he says, has lessened the area of private exploitation. True, but has it not also increased the power of the *State* to rob, as in the case of the Post-Office? What is the difference to me whether I sell my labour to a joint-stock company called the State, or to a private capitalist? *Never* has the worker received so little of his actual products as now, despite these steps toward State Socialism. In America again, where money reigns supreme, and where fortunes are made more rapidly than in any other country, there is also a corresponding amount of destitution and crime, despite the fact that they have also taken a few of those practical steps toward Social-Democracy (such as the ballot, free education, abolition of State church, &c.) yet in NO country in the world is legal rascality and robbery carried on to such an extent. Voters are bought and sold like cattle, while elections are reduced to the level of a dog-fight.

Again, we quote (Fabian Essays) from Mrs Besant, under heading "Industry under Socialism." This theosophical, middle-class lady tells the working man that out of the value of communal produce MUST come the *rent* of land, payable to the local authorities; rent of plant; wages advanced, *and fixed in the usual way*; taxes, reserve fund, and all necssary expenses, which would *include* the voting of their own salaries!—This is precisely our position to-day, minus the fixed wage by the state. Again we are told that a workman would HAVE to accommodate himself to *whatever* occupation they appointed, whether he liked it or not.

This woman again says that the strongest possible stimulus will force men to work; in fact to work or starve will be the order of the day under Social-Democracy. She also kindly intimates that if any man refuse to comply with this system of workhouse socialism, he would be turned adrift; and after this joint-stock company called the state had driven all private capitalists to the wall, it would mean absolute starvation to any worker who might object to being dressed, housed, and worked, to suit the Annie Besant type. Seldom indeed has such a programme been put forward by any political party, the inauguration of which, as Herbert Spencer very truly says, would be THE COMING SLAVERY. Many of the followers of the Social-Democrats are honest, others who acknowledge that they are *paid* for advocating Social-Democracy are not honest; for we saw that during the unemployed agitation the self-styled organizers and paid men of the S. D.F. tried to prevent any man speaking who opposed their ideas, not only did they incite the rougher element against other speakers, but actually boycotted the unemployed from the Social-Democratic platform, because they *differed* in opinion. Trifling as these incidents may appear yet we can trace the hand of the would-be politician behind them; now while this unfairness was partly due to ignorance, and partly for what could be made out of the movement by these men, it was different with those who hired them; what fun for those municipal jacks-in-office, and the would be M. Ps. and labour leaders now seeking pay and position, to spread themselves in Trafalgar Square, as self-elected chairmen at the unemployed meetings; while their dupes were rallying the apathetic and tramping through slush and jeers behind some rag on a stick, the motto on which many could not even read. It is sad indeed to see workingmen to-day, despite the lessons of the past, still so blind to their own interest that they will *yet* place a weapon in the hands of the politician to beat them with.

DEMOCRACY IN PRACTICE.

At a Congress of the Social-Democratic party, held in Berlin November 1892, it was decided by delegates of the above party *not* to celebrate the 1st of May 1893 by a cessation of work because the delegates to the Congress candidly admitted that they might *lose votes* and damage their cause at the next election.

These plundering rascals, such as Vollmar and Bebel, many of whom own enormous wealth, do not want to lose caste with the robbers of industry. These mouchers, who for years past have been collecting the pence of the exploited German workman, now pretend to be anxious for his welfare; fearing meanwhile that the proletariat in losing their chains might stop their leaders' salaries: and this in a country where a workmen's meeting cannot

be held without the presence of a state official to report to the Government all that takes place. This is Social-Democracy in Germany to-day after all the money and energy that has been spent to return so many of these men to power. So in England, their motives appear to be equally sordid, as WAGE-FUNDS are raised from the half-starved workers by labor leaders under the guise of labour representation. What the Salvation Army is to the ignorant in matters religious, Social-Democracy is to the workman in politics; for as in the former case the lower classes had lost all faith in the church, so that a new species of mental hypnotism became essential as a prop to bolster up a rotten structure, so in the latter case, as workingmen began to despise all former governments because of their undisguised tyranny, it has become an imperative necessity for the politician to mask his evil designs by such pet phrases as "Government by the People," "one man one vote," Municipal control of gas, water, tramways, &c, &c." But after all, even the Tory tyrant is to be preferred to the sneak who crawls into office by such treacherous methods. Tyranny undisguised is better than tyranny disguised; for while intelligent men know what to do with the first, the other blinds many by cant and dissimulation.

Experience proves that whether in Germany, America, France, or England, wherever Social-Democracy is known, even to-day before they have actually gained legal power, they are equally as relentless and cruel against all who may differ from them as any other political party that has ever preceded them.

INDIVIDUALISM.

As considerable confusion seems to exist in the minds of many as to the relation between Anarchism and Individualism, I will here try to explain. On the one hand we are told in the Fabian Essays, and by S. D. F. speakers that poverty is produced by the present individualist system. But such is not the case, for, I would ask, what becomes of the individuality of the disinherited, the out of work, and of the many on the verge of starvation? It is self-evident that if every man asserted his right to live, and rebelled against that co-operative monopoly called the Government, tyranny would cease. It is thus clear, in this sense, that oppression is due to man's loss of individuality. Yet another class of ignorant spouters tell the people that we Anarchists advocate the right of man to rob, if he be strong enough and brutal enough; and that Anarchism means a return to barbarism, and that under its sway co-operative production would become a thing of the past. Many who so speak are wilful perverters of the truth, mere political pedlars of the S. D. F. type, who, finding their own nostrums getting stale, and Anarchism popular, take

this cowardly advantage, and tell lies to predjudice the people against us. But to the thoughtful and impartial mind it must be apparent that no man, not even a hermit, could live without using the tools of production—which represent the labour of the past—or exchanging something for the products of present labour.

Anarchism, then, implies the right of voluntary co-operation; also the right of secession. One tie alone would bind, namely, self-interest; and thus selfishness if nothing more would impel man to co-operation, knowing that this unity would secure to himself much more than he could gain by isolated effort. When land and capital are free to all, man will still be as diversified as now. There never will be two men alike. Mental and physical differences thus existing, it would be tyranny to force men to unite where no reciprocity of sentiment existed.

But all those in favour of the abolition of government can work together; when the legalised bully is sent about his business, then and then only can we come to a complete understanding with each other. When this takes place these merely technical differences will vanish of themselves.

THE SPREAD OF IDEAS, AND THE PRESS.

When the art of printing was first introduced, it was thought that it would immediately give an impetus to the spread of ideas and would prove a most powerful weapon for the emancipation of labour. Unfortunately this has proved true only to a very limited extent. Why? Because, like labour-saving machinery, the Press has become monopolised; so that instead of it being utilized to lighten the burden of the suffering poor, it is used to-day to extract more profit from their labour for those who toil not, for while the diffusion of knowledge and the education of the workers is absolutely necessary before any *effectual* blow can be struck at Land-Monopoly, the press, being monopolised to-day and used *solely* in the interest of the capitalist, is one of the most powerful factors in the promulgation of falsehood.

Driven to desperation by this insane system of competition resulting from monopoly and the inability to secure by honest toil, a decent living, many a man prostitutes his intellect, and against his better nature, writes leading articles in the daily press to gull the workers, and to poison their minds against men whose arguments their paymasters are unable to meet. And, as a rule, the more advanced, the more radical their professed opinions, so also, the more cowardly and cunning is the sophistry they use against those who are too honest to compromise with the politician. These sensation mongers sometimes affect great indignation and horror at what they are pleased to call "outrages," meaning the act of some human being who, having all the finer

instincts of his nature crushed out by the brutality of law, in desperation strikes back a blow at the damnable system which had hitherto denied him the right to live.

Thus, the reptile editors of the press, who are the very worst of labour-sweaters themselves, incite to murder men, even now, whose only crime is that that they have the intelligence and courage to expose the treacherous and cowardly action of the modern editor, and of others whose fortunes have been built upon the wreck of humanity.

But the immunity they have hitherto enjoyed in thus manufacturing public opinion will soon be over. Their dirty tricks are being discovered by working men, so that the time is fast approaching when, if the press does not moderate its snivel and blackmail, we shall be compelled in self-defence to *use* the "resources of civilization" against them.

CHAINS OF SLAVERY—THE FOREIGNER.

Various and many have been the devices set up by tyrants to enslave and rob the poor. Not the least of these are the so-called boundaries that divide nations. Legal geographical lines are these drawn across our planet by puny man, and their frontiers guarded by one portion of the disinherited to the injury of the others, *to* this end—that rulers and popes may have the royal sport of setting one poor dupe at the throat of another, and of witnessing this spectacle of butchery and bloodshed in war, by men who would otherwise be friends.

Meanwhile the instigators, the brutal law-givers, and the pious frauds on both sides,—at a safe distance—meet together to praise God while this horrible carnage goes on. A petty quarrel between some fossilized old crank in the papal chair, and the occupant of some bloodstained throne, or a common understanding among the ruling powers that it is necessary to thin the ranks of the propertyless outcasts because their authority is menaced, or, more generally, the wish to destroy the power of the revolutionary few who seek to educate the masses,—any of the above is a sufficient cause to plunge the nations into a cruel war, the expenses of which, either in life or treasure, they (the rulers) do not contribute.

The Foreigner! The man who coined that word must have been either fool or tyrant. Man is a citizen of the WORLD; but even from a commercial point of view those who come here are not only producers, but consumers also; and were this idiotic conception carried to its logical issue even under the present system, we as a nation should be the greatest sufferers. Besides, he who leaves his native shore to seek a home in a far-off land

does so, in most instances, to get away from the tyranny of monopoly; and thus the interests of the proletarian are identical the world over.

The dividend mongers and labour sweaters do not allow nationality to mar their united efforts to rob us; why then should we not take a lesson from them? Let us then grasp the outstretched hand of our brother slave, whatever his creed, nationality, or colour. For there are, in *reality*, but two classes in the world:—the Robbers, and the Robbed. And certain it is that if we wish to bring about the solidarity of labour, this can only be done upon an international basis.

ANARCHY—V—RELIGION.

While we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that the professors of religions have always been the most strenuous supporters of tyranny, still we look upon religion as a mere geographical question, that is, in so far as the working-class element is concerned. But with those who run these superstition factories (churches,) as most parsons do, for *pelf*, it is different. It is obvious that the mere conscientious belief in religion could work no harm if *divested* of the power of law-making. The cruelties of the Spanish Inquisition would not have happened in the absence of law. If of the 1,500,000,000 of the world's population each man held a separate creed, no harm would occur from this *alone*; but in the past we find when Roman Catholicism was the prevalent religion throughout Europe, it simultaneously became a political power. Even powerful monarchs of that time were dictated to by the pope who could unmake kings at will.

So in England, after the so-called Reformation of Luther, Erasmus, Swingle, and Melancthon, and during the reigns of Protestant kings and queens, the Catholics were treated like mad dogs. Why? Because by their numbers the Protestants were able to pass Acts of Parliament, and thus legalize their ill-treatment of the Catholics.

To-day then, working men and women may unite, whatever their creed, colour, or nation, to fight the common enemy. So with the temperance party, many of whom are earnest and thoughtful, and if they could only see with us that the solution of the labour, poverty, and even the drink question, lies in the freeing of the land and capital from the curse of monopoly. Then we could all work from a common platform.

For the interest of all who live by productive labour is identical if we could only see it. Let us then throw aside prejudice, and with an impartial, unbiassed mind stand shoulder to shoulder to abolish the *politician*, through whose instrumentality we are all enslaved alike.

POVERTY.

Never, in the history of the world, can we point to a time when there was so much wealth, or the means of producing food, clothing, and shelter, so great as at present. Yet never was there a time when the producer received such a small portion of the value of his production as now. According to Mr Giffen, in 1783 the wealth of the United Kingdom did not exceed £200, 000,000. But in 1883 it was valued at £1,270,000,000, a growth of over £1,000,000,000, in a hundred years! The same writer states that in 1885 the average value of the produce was £250 per head of the population, or £1,350 per family. We ask the question—Who produced this wealth. Why does England's workman starve?

In a return of verdicts and inquests, for England and Wales 1889, there were 2,378 persons found dead, 1,331 children suffocated in bed, and 398 persons died from want and exposure. From the returns of the Lunacy Commissioners for 1890, we find that out of a total of 86,067 persons of unsound mind, 77,257 were *paupers.* On the one side we see boundless wealth and arrogance. On the other side, the most abject poverty, and alas! servility.

Archdeacon Farrar recently stated in Convocation that there were, in London alone, over 80,000 known prostitutes, and 60,000 families living in single rooms. According to the School Board returns issued in the latter half of 1889, 44,000 children attended Board-schools in want of food. And so we might go on, *ad infinitum.*

WHAT IS ANARCHISM?

Briefly stated it is the negation of all *artificial* forms of government, or in other words the denial of man's right to rob his fellow either legally or otherwise. It implies reciprocal liberty, and the free association of man for mutual benefits without the sacrifice of his own individuality; the consummation of which can never be possible until we have the UNCONDITIONAL right to use natural resources in land and capital without paying tribute to any other human being.

Machinery, railways, currency, and every tool necessary for reproduction, must also be equally free and accessible to all. For representing as these do the consecutive thought and labour of countless generations, and as no man could, or can now tell precisely what part he, or those who have preceded him, had in the production of this immense industrial fabric, justice demands that these should be freely used to-day for mutual benefit. And our duty to posterity also demands that they should be handed

down to them, not only unimpaired, but both improved and augmented.

THE FIRST STEP TOWARDS FREEDOM.

There is a certain class of objectors who, while agreeing with us that Anarchism is a good thing, think that our ideas of realizing it are utopian. They say that with so much ignorance prevalent, and with the present tendency to vice and crime, the accomplishment of our ideal is a very long way off. That this is partially true we are willing to admit, for the effects of past governments will take a long time to eradicate.

But we are also aware, by the lessons that history teaches us, that if we would take even a first step in order to gain a concession, however small, this can only be done by RESISTANCE TO LAW; rebellion against law in the past has been the *only* factor by which we have gained even the slightest reform, but we are always willing to aid any party to a real reform, but never to compromise with tyranny; for between the politician and the Anarchist there can be *no possible reconciliation.*

We are told by others, that to take the policeman from duty would mean bloodshed, sacking of shops, &c., &c. Possibly so; but that merely proves the brutality of the system under which the people have lived. Like the enraged tiger at the sight of blood, so would the ignorant and hitherto pent-up worker feel at the sight of good food, clothing, and shelter, that had been so long denied him.

But there is also another side of the question; for the fact that the masses are ignorant proves that it would take a long time to educate them even to understand Anarchism. Revolutions are not made in a day; they are a growth. We are living to-day in the midst of revolution, both economic and industrial. *Education precedes every lasting improvement;* hence when the total collapse of governments takes place a great portion of the people will have become intelligent, and thus prepared for a higher life.

At any rate we, the workers, have nothing to lose but our shackles; so that whate'er betides, or whatever system is evolved from the destruction of the present one, it could not be a worse one for the disinherited.

THE MORROW OF THE REVOLUTION.

The qestion is often asked—How would you carry on production when you have abolished the monopolist and the policeman? Our answer is this:—The monopolist does not produce to-day, his only function is to rob the worker after *he* has produced; and the only duty the policeman has, is to see that the workingman does *not* take it back. But if it should be asked, how the manu

facture of boots, clothing, cultivation of land, the development of our mineral resources, the building of viaducts, railways, or the defence of our coasts, etc., etc,, would be managed, the answer is also very simple, namely : the same people who do so now ; with this vast difference—that as we should then produce for *use* instead of *profit*, not more than one tenth of the labour would then be required.

In England and Wales in 1888, only 298 out of every thousand were engagedin agricultural and industrial pursuits. Of these, not half were employed in productive labour. Hoyle says that 1½ hours labour to-day would be sufficient to supply all rational wants; that is, if all did their share in production. Butas science is only in its infancy at present, we might reasonably expect that when man had time for reflection, and a respite from this ceaseless struggle for a crust, we should have a thousand discoveries where to-day we have but one. Again we should still have our architects, builders, engineers, draughtsmen, scientists, philosophers, miners, and agriculturists. If we reflect, it is certain that those wind-bags at Westminster are producing nothing useful; they are merely engaged in forging new fetters to bind the intellect. Human tricksters! who neither toil nor spin. Does that vast army of touts and flunkies attending to the paraphernalia of courts and figure-heads, produce? Is that slimy creature, that mental prostitute known as a detective a producer? All these to-day are simply the robbers of industry.

But suppose there were no scientists, philosophers, engineers, or architects now, *could* any government produce or create them? Tyranny has never produced anything except oppression; a clog on a horse's leg does not aid its power of travelling.

When men volunteer to unite under a free system to produce for mutual benefits, each knowing that he will receive the *full* results of his labour, the inducement to work will be ten times greater than now; and this voluntary organization of human beings can be the only true basis of human justice. Under this system of voluntary co-öperative production the only bond needed will be self-interest.

IS IT PEACE, OR WAR?

Living in an age when the average life of the worker, in years, is but half that of those who live upon his labour, at a time when thousands are annually driven insane through want alone, where suicides and deaths from starvation are of daily occurrence, when, from the cellars and garrets of this the wealthiest city in the world the agonizing and despairing cry of the widow and orphan is heard for bread, in an age when the workhouse ward and prison cell claim the best citizens, where the lives of thousands of

dozen, women, and even helpless children are crushed out in the factory hells, the mines, and the workshop' yearly, when even the features of men and women are almost unrecognizable through grinding toil for profit-mongers, and where women are driven to prostitute their bodies at street corners almost in open daylight that they may be able to carry home a crust for a starving child: enough! No words can portray, no pen can adequately describe the horrible butcheries carried on daily in the name of law and religion. And this too, when, according to Mr Redgrave (factory inspector) our power of production has increased a hundredfold in fifty years. In a country which has 30,000,000, acres of uncultivated land, a country also that would support, according to governmental statisticians, if its resources were rightly developed six times its present population—here we see boundless wealth on the one hand, and crime and poverty on the other. Seeing that this is true, where is the man so brutal, or the heart so callous that he would say PEACE! or deny the worker the right to use *any weapon* to DESTROY this system?

But strange as this may appear to the man or woman of feeling or pity, it is nevertheless true, that thousands of ruffianly gospel-grinders to-day are actually preaching *contentmeut* to the helpless victims of an infamous government. Why? Because, like the modern editor, they daily receive a portion of the plunder which has been wrung from the labourer as their share, for keeping the workpeople quiet while this process of robbery goes on.

Thus it is that the Press and the Pulpit, the Stockjobber and the Shylock work hand in hand to rob us and our children; and will continue to do so until we take common action, irrespective of creed, occupation, or nationality, to stop their plundering by *fighting for our own liberty.*

IS REPELLANT FORCE JUSTIFIABLE?

If it is true the monopoly of land and of natural resources is the cause of poverty, ignorance, and crime,—and no sane or intelligent man ever attempts to deny it—then whatever government defends this monopoly, if we would be either logical or just to ourselves and our children, we are bound by all the ties of Nature and Morality to destroy.

But my quarrel is not so much with the capitalist as with the politician, for I am free to admit that there is no difference in attributes between the landlord and the laborer; and if an exchange of places happened to-morrow, the one would be as bad as the other. For just as the government by plebeians in ancient Rome proved itself to be one of the greatest curses, so would a government by the masses to-day be most intolerable.

Man by birth is neither vicious nor virtuous, but the history of all past times clearly demonstrates that when he becomes invested with power he always uses it for his own advantage. This is human nature; and it very forcibly illustrates the folly and tyranny of the would-be workingman politician, who only sees in the capture of the political machine a weapon of revenge to use against the "classes" which could only end like all previous governments in the subjugation of humanity, and the complete enslavement of the worker's own class also.

Why is one man allowed to own 1,000 acres, while another is a trespasser in the land of his birth. Simply because this robbery is legalized; the forces of the state are always at the disposal of the landowner. Thus murder by law becomes the order of the day. Force, brutal and barbaric, law, *and law alone* then, is the only barrier that stands between the starving multitudes and their right to live.

Whatever evolution or previous events may have had to do with the establishment of this hideous political regime the fact remains the same; namely, that reciprocal freedom can never be obtained until GOVERNMENTS ARE DESTROYED.

He who invades anothers rights commits a crime; thus every politician is a criminal; and the fact that he governs by the consent of those he robs, who vote through ignorance, only intensifies his guilt, inasmuch as their ignorance is due to the brutality of *past* governments. To gain our FREEDOM, we *must demand the unconditional right* to use the implements of production, also the land and capital; and we must *deny the right of any other man or men to tax us for so doing*, whether under the plea of land-nationalization, state-control, or any other dodge got up by the politician.

WEAPONS AND METHODS.

The Anarchist does not seek to destroy anything that is useful in society; for self-interest alone prompts the other way. Reason is the principal weapon that we rely on; and where reasonable freedom is allowed for the promulgation of truth, even the capitalists have nothing to fear. *We cannot have a better state of things, or move faster than the average intelligence of the people will allow;* and we are fully aware that all lasting reforms spring from knowledge.

But when, as in America, Spain, France, and England, a set of scoundrels are employed to hatch plots, and are in daily receipt of blood-money to entrap and murder by false evidence honest workers in the cause of humanity, they must not be surprised at reprisals. If the politician fails to recognize that the hitherto ill-used and long-sleeping giant of Labour is awakening, and attempts by his besom to sweep from the horizon the storm-clouds of wrath now rapidly advancing, and is overwhelmed in consequence, that is his look-out, not ours. Neither ought it to surprise any sane person if, when a man is driven by the brutality of law to contemplate suicide—as many thousands *are*—or being on the point of starvation from the same cause, that he should strike a blow at the administrator of that law, before doing so. For, when the Right to Life is denied, as it *is* to-day, *any* weapon is *justifiable;* and any man who would deny us the right to use a weapon, however drastic, to free ourselves is a traitor and enemy to the human race. LIBERTY IS NEVER GIVEN. Who would be free, *himself* must strike the blow!

When we review the slaughter of millions in wars, religious massacres, &c, sanctioned and engendered by laws in the past, when we see to-day in every land and clime that is cursed by political domination millions of trained men ready to fly at the throats of their fellow-men at the bid of a handful of tyrants, at a time when Europe is bristling with bayonets, and our whole country one huge arsenal for the manufacture of life-destroying weapons of warfare, then it becomes idiotic and childish to talk of patience. Whenever, in the past, man has forced concessions, traitors and cowards have always come forward to tell him that the time was not ripe. Where tyranny exists revolution is *always* justifiable, but if, in this age of cowardice, we fear the traitor or the spy, all the powers on earth cannot prevent each man from fighting for himself. *Isolated* individual action will *successfully* defy all the political pimpery of our time, and is the only weapon we can at present employ against the organized tyranny of disciplined troops.

THE OUTLOOK.

To the student of history and the thoughtful wage-slave there are not wanting signs of encouragement to-day, and although history repeats itself to a certain extent, there is a vast difference in degree.

As our cause nears a crisis, its momentum becomes accelerated; and while it is the duty of all true men to act at the present juncture, not letting opportunity slip, nor allowing the reactionist to put back the dial-hand of progress, the faint-hearted, and others who would gladly hasten events but for causes over which they have no control, may take courage. For, as the Grand Old Sham says "the flowing tide is with us." Anarchism has come to stay. The worst that can happen to any one of us is death, a penalty that all must pay at some time; but as Byron very truly says "They never *fail* who die in a just cause."

Fossilized Europe has already been shaken from centre to circumference. As an Anarchist I am thankful to have lived in a time when a few effectual blows have already been struck at this citadel of legal despotism, sustained by those twin relics of barbarism—the priest, and the politician

The mob-rule party in Germany, once a powerful factor, has now been broken up; and the time, I think, will speedily come when the political leaders will have none to represent but themselves. Should that desirable time arrive, they would inevitably share the fate of the Kilkenny cats.

As to the means of carrying on our propaganda that some are so anxious about, there need be no fear. When the principle of Anarchism is understood it forms part of man's nature, and even a coward becomes brave. Neither bars nor bolts can effectually prevent anarchistic propaganda, except for the moment. When men once get the *idea*, no fear but that they will find the *money* when necessary. Cadging and touting form no part of an Anarchist program, and wherever indulged in have done no good, either in England or elsewhere.

Money supplied by some well-meaning people (but as we now see mere arm-chair faddists) in the earlier stages of our movement only had the effect of drawing around it sneaks and mouchers, who have since proved themselves traitors; while the remnant have returned like a dog to its vomit, and now hang on the skirts of their monied friends for the sake of what they can get.

But, despite all drawbacks, the clouds are breaking; the dawn has already appeared; and we can see, as it were in a vision, even now, the promised land. Thanks to the noble and heroic efforts of our comrades who have preceded us, truth, crushed to earth, has risen again; and their blood has been the seed that is now ripening into glorious fruit. Let us then be *men*; not mere driftwood on the ocean of time; and though the dark billows of Superstition and Tyranny threaten at times to engulf us and bury in oblivion all that is noble and good in human nature, yet to the discerning mind and prophetic eye there is a brighter and a happier future for the human race: a future *brighter and better* than has ever been dreamed of either by poets or philosophers.

In this hope we will *struggle*; in this hope we must DARE, again and again; and in this hope if necessary we must DIE.